



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

W

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,937	06/26/2003	Ichirou Miyagawa	Q76019	3417
23373	7590	06/08/2006	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				PHAM, HAI CHI
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2861	

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/603,937	MIYAGAWA, ICHIROU
	Examiner Hai C. Pham	Art Unit 2861

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hai C. Pham. (3) Susan P. Pan, Attorney.
 (2) Duane Minley, Applicant's Representative. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 01 June 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Gao et al. (US 2003/0151820).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



HAI PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

1. Applicant's Representative argues that Gao's refracting optical system array, which includes two pairs of prisms, divides the incident light beam into four light beams, while the claimed array refracting element, which comprises at least two pair units, divides the incident light beam into only two light beams. The examiner indicates that claim 11 does not clearly state that only two divisional light beams would be formed by the at least two pair units and that such argument would require a support from the Specification.
2. Applicant's Representative further argues that the resulting divided light beams would increase the resolution of the formed image. However, such limitation is not recited in the base claim 11, which as such would not overcome the rejection based on Gao.
3. Applicant's Representative proposes to amend claim 11 to include that the refracting element pair directly transmits one light beam while refracts at an angle another light beam to overcome the prior art made of record. The examiner indicates that the Disclosure shows different structures of the refracting element array, i.e., Figure 7B shows one structure of the refracting element array where one light beam is transmitted through without being refracted while another light beam is refracted, and Figure 8D shows another structure of the refracting element array, which would refract any incoming light beam.

HCP
6/1/06